

Rev. T. J. ...
METLAKAH

Church Missionary Society

a
 o
 H
 V
 h
 h
 o
 t
 n
 e
 e
 t
 c
 e
 f
 t
 c
 a
 i
 l
 i

METLAKAHTLA AND THE C. M. S.

Being a defence of the position taken by the Native Christians and their teachers, and an answer to the charges brought against them.

Ever since the rise of the unhappy dissensions between the C. M. S. and the native Christians, we, though urged by our friends to come forward, have hitherto held back, and thus the C. M. S. have made their statements without contradiction, and many of their friends and supporters no doubt think that we have kept silent because we were unable to refute these statements. Such however is not the case; we had good reasons for remaining silent up to the present. Our respect and affection for the Society with which we had been so long connected, our unwillingness to believe that the Society were aware of what their agents here were doing, or that they would sanction their actions, our hope that the Society would have their eyes opened to the true state of affairs, but above all, the fact that it was no plan or wish of ours to oppose the Society by setting up an opposition mission or church, but simply to endeavor to assist these native converts to establish and maintain what they wished and had asked for, an independent native church. Now, however, the case is altered, two deputies sent by the C. M. S. have visited Metlakahltla, and extracts from their report have been published by the Society, and the Committee have expressed their determination to continue the line of action adopted by Bishop Ridley. We feel that to remain longer silent would be to permit the gravest mis-statements to pass for truth.

In presenting for the consideration of all who may be interested in Metlakahltla a short defence of the position assumed by the native Christians and their teachers, we will first call attention to a reply by the Rev. R. Tomlinson to the article on the Deputies' report published in the September number of the C. M. S. *Intelligencer* under the heading "Metlakahltla." Attached to this reply are copies of the correspondence between the Deputies and the native Chris-

10391

Pacific N. W. History Dept.
PROVINCIAL LIBRARY
VICTORIA, B. C.

tians and Mr. Tomlinson. Mr. Duncan will soon publish a separate pamphlet giving an account of the troubles caused at Metlakahltla by the agent of the C. M. S.

WILLIAM DUNCAN
ROBERT TOMLINSON.

A reply to the Article on Metlakahltla in the Church Missionary Intelligencer of September, 1885.

In their preface to this Article the C. M. S. ask their readers to refer to the account of the Government Commission at Metlakahltla which appears in the *Intelligencer* of May, 1885. Anyone who does so will find there, p. 240, as follows: "Almost up to the time of the separation there was no reason to suppose that the Mission was other than a distinctively Church of England one," and if he will then turn to their present Article at p. 663, he will read: "It had long been known to the Committee that the Mission which had been so favorably begun was not being carried on according to the principles which they upheld, or in a way which they could approve." Here is an evident contradiction. Does not this show what straits the Society are put to in their effort to exonerate themselves, and at the same time condemn Mr. Duncan? They clearly see that to be found supporting the line of action which Bishop Ridley initiated, and opposing what they had so long supported and approved, requires an explanation. They refuse to admit to themselves or their supporters what is undoubtedly the true reason, viz., that with changing years *they* have changed, and that where once they were satisfied with a union in spirit and doctrine with their converts, they now demand uniformity in ritual and practice. They cannot deny that they approved of and praised the work as carried on at Metlakahltla, but they are unwilling to adopt the straightforward course and acknowledge that their views have changed, and so it is that in casting about for some plausible excuse, they find themselves aground on one of the many quicksands which ever beset those who desert the path of rectitude. And now we would ask, whom did the C. M. S. Deputies come to Metlakahltla to see? Not Mr. Duncan, for he was in England, and did not reach Metlakahltla until all their interviews with the native Christians were finished. Then why in their report are they chiefly concerned with censuring him? Let any one who has read the C. M. S. publications since the founding of Metlakahltla collect a few of the many notices of that Mission wherein Mr. Duncan is spoken of in terms of affection,

praise and admiration by the Society and its friends, and then try to realize that this is the Mr. Duncan referred to in the Deputies' report where he is said to be undoing his former great work, deliberately disobeying his Lord; inciting the Indians to riot and lawless acts, that it was he who from pride and jealousy "drove all the ordained Ministers from Metlakahtla" and demanded that it should be a lay Mission, claimed all the C. M. S. funds that passed through his hands as his own, denied that he was assisted by, or connected with, the C. M. S. at any time; persecuted the few faithful who still adhered to the C. M. S., and demanded \$0 dollars from each of them; and lastly, that, "it was his unconciliatory temper that thwarted every effort the Deputies could devise for the creation of harmonious action between the two sections." History repeats itself, but who would have thought that after the lapse of so many years the conduct of the people of Lystra towards Paul and Barnabas would be repeated by the C. M. S. with the difference, that while the one used stones, the C. M. S. used the deadlier weapon of the pen.

The deputies say they "made every exertion to ascertain the exact state of public opinion at Metlakhatla." They addressed the Indians and received their replies in writing. The wording of the English of these replies is by Mr. Tomlinson, but he studiously avoided introducing anything except what had been decided upon by the Indians in meeting assembled. This course, suggested by the people themselves, was deemed the wisest, as it enabled the Deputies to arrive at what the Indians wished to say, in the easiest way. The Deputies were on the spot and were assisted by an adherent of the C. M. S., as interpreter, whom they had chosen with the special object of preventing their being imposed upon. If the Deputies had any doubt that these letters accurately expressed what the Indians said, why did they not raise the question when at Metlakhatla? They never expressed the least doubt to the people while here. Moreover when addressing the Indians, they spoke of their letters as "your words," "your letters," but now, unwilling or unable to meet these words of truth and soberness, they presume to doubt that they emanated from the Indians. Is not such an imputation unworthy of the men themselves, and the great Society which has endorsed it? No fair-minded person can read the extracts from the Deputies' report and compare them with the Indians' letters and not be struck with the absence of any attempt on the part of the Deputies or the Society, to meet the Indians on their own ground.

Abuse of Mr. Duncan, interspersed with remarks derogatory to Mr. Tomlinson, the conduct of the Mission work, and the people's condition is not an answer, it is only a repetition of the old story: "no case, abuse the opposing counsel." While we felt so sure of the justice of the Indians' cause, that no stand could be maintained against it without deserting the platform of truth and Christian principle, we did not anticipate that the C. M. S. would be found relying upon misstatements and untruths to aid them in opposing a large body of native Christians, struggling to maintain Christian law and order in their settlement; and whose whole creed and practice is based upon the written word of God. These are hard words, and I would to God they were not true; but how can we think otherwise when we read the following statements which we know to be one and all simply untrue.

1st. at p 665. "When the Mission was, in its infancy, removed from Fort Simpson to Metlakahla, the chief, at whose suggestion the change was made, gave the Society the piece of land on which his own house was built, and the principal Mission buildings were erected on it." 2nd, at p. 667. "Mr Duncan represented all the funds that passed through his hands as his personal property, and the Society was practically ignored. In fact there is clear evidence that on one occasion he distinctly told the Indians that the Society had never sent him, or supported him, or gave him anything." 3rd, at p. 669. "He (Mr Duncan) ultimately drove them (the ordained Missionaries) away one after another." 4th, at p 669. "His last demand was that Metlakahla should be carried on purely as a lay Mission." 5th, at p. 672. "If they were allowed to purchase at all, it was at the risk of insults and annoyance. It was therefore imperative that another store should be established for the benefit of these Indians, otherwise they would have to suffer the worst penalties of the petty boycotting system." 6th. at p 673. "Another extraordinary regulation was that a demand was made on each person who adhered to the Society for the payment of thirty dollars, which sum, it was alleged, had been given by M. Duncan, from his own money, to nearly every householder as an assistance in building his house." All these were learned from hearsay, and in no instance could the deputies have made any *bona fide* attempt to verify them and yet they are set down as absolute, facts by these very men who say, p. 666. "We were careful to set aside mere hearsay and surmises and to learn the facts on full and reliable evidence."

Let us now consider these statements *seriatim*. 1st. If

the deputies had enquired of some of those who accompanied Mr. Duncan when he first settled at Metlakahtla (and several of them were among those who met the deputies), they would have learned the true state of the case and seen how groundless their statement was. 2nd. The deputies say they read this statement. Where did they read it? and why did they not produce this "clear evidence?" Why did they not ask the Indians if any such representation had ever been made by Mr. Duncan? 3rd. They need only to have examined the documents in the Society's possession and they would have known that Mr. Duncan was not responsible for any of those leaving Metlakahtla. The Rev. F. B. Gribbell left on account of his wife's health, the Rev. R. A. Doolan was unwillingly compelled to return on account of death in his family at home, and the Rev. A. J. Hall was moved to Fort Rupert on the advice of Bishop Bompas. There were only these three ordained Missionaries sent to Metlakahtla who left it before the separation. 4th. The demand that Metlakahtla be made a lay Mission was made at a conference held at Metlakahtla in August, 1881, by the Revs. Hall and Collison, without consulting Mr. Duncan or obtaining his consent, as can be learned from the minutes in the possession of the Society. 5th. It was only necessary to ask for the names of those thus treated to clear up this wilful mis-statement. 6th. No such demand was made by Mr. Duncan from any of the Society's adherents for the repayment of the thirty dollars he had given to assist them in building their homes, here again it was only necessary to ask for the name of the one who it is said paid that amount and this statement would have appeared in its true light as utterly untrue. Intense indeed was the feeling of painful surprise in the minds of these simple minded Christians at the utter disregard for truth into which the Deputies and the Society have permitted themselves to be led. But it is not alone by the untruths above referred to that the animus of the Deputies and the Society against the native Christians and their teachers at Metlakahtla is shown. The very way in which they give expression to the praise which a fear of contradicting members and friends of the Society who have at various times visited Metlakahtla has wrung from them together with a succession of mis-statements and half-statements all clearly show this. For example, in the opening paragraph of Mr. Morris, statement he would have us believe that it was only years ago, at the beginning of his labors, that Mr. Duncan displayed any missionary devotion, etc.; whereas up to the very time of the

separation the progress of the work was receiving the very warmest praise, not only from the society but also from those in authority. Even Bishop Ridley on his arrival sent home a letter expressing his approbation, and Admiral Prevost, a vice-president, who had twice visited Metlakahtla, shortly before the separation addressed numerous meetings in England on his return on behalf of the C. M. S., and on each occasion spoke in praise of Metlakahtla.

The Statement that Mr. Duncan visited England last year on his private business is one of those half-statements which has adroitly been turned to make a point against him. His visit to England was made for the sake of these people and with the hope of aiding in the settlement of these unhappy troubles, but because while in England he transacted some private business, if such a term can be applied to a business which so intimately affects the temporal welfare of these people, it is asserted he went for that purpose. Again the Deputies speaking of the case of Ada Stanley say, "he (Mr. Duncan) alleged that the shawl which was taken from Ada Stanley in default of payment was voluntarily given, but in point of fact it was given to avoid imprisonment," the fact being that the village rule which she violated does not include imprisonment in case of non-payment of fines; and further they go on to say that the two men sent to prison in this case by the Stipendiary Magistrate were only set free on technical grounds, implying that they were really guilty, but only escaped through some flaw in the proceedings, whereas had they enquired of any one present in Court when the Judge signed his order for their release, they would have learned that they had not violated the law, and further that the village has power to make rules and impose fines so long as they do not use compulsion.

The above are only a few out of a number of statements of a similar class, but a perusal of the correspondence and Mr. Duncan's statement, will bring to mind and refute many more. In no one instance, perhaps, does the bitter animosity of the Deputies and the Society, show itself more clearly than when they came to speak of the Lord's Supper. This is a subject of the deepest interest to every friend and supporter of the C. M. S., and without doubt the Deputies and the Society owed it to these friends, to give them a clear account of the reasons which these Christian Indians gave, for not yet having this rite established among them. The Deputies never so much as mentioned that they had brought this matter before the people and yet they had

given the Deputies a clear exposition of their views on it; but they deliberately charge Mr. Duncan with withholding the rite, and this too, in contradiction to the Indians' plain statement, could their bitterest enemy have acted more unfairly? And here, it can scarcely escape the notice of even an ordinary reader of the C. M. S. account, how unwilling the Society has shown itself to publish the Indians' words. From the beginning of this trouble, it has been characteristic of all the notices in the Society's publications bearing on the subject, that they have abstained from publishing any one of the many communications they have received both from these people and their teachers. If only some independent Christian minds could gain access to the correspondence from both sides, how astonished they would be at the real state of the case; and how grieved that the Society has so persistently misrepresented it!

Mr. Blackett, in speaking of the religious teaching among these people, after admitting that the attendance at public worship was all that could be desired, reproduces the sneer uttered against the Apostles of old. "Whence have these men learning" because he found native teachers whose knowledge of English he considered limited, teaching "with only an English bible in their hand," they were teaching word by word, only brief texts. He does not even urge that there was any error in the teaching, but simply because these native teachers were following the old scripture rule of "line upon line, precept upon precept, here a *little* and there a *little*," he would cast them aside and replace them with European priests, who with their ignorance of the language, idiom, and habits of thought of these people could not give them even this little accurately. The Deputies say further, p. 668, "we heard of no gatherings for prayer or for mutual edification, and there are no signs of missionary zeal among them; nor any attempt to make known the Gospel to their heathen fellow-countrymen." We can thank God that this is only true as far as the Deputies are concerned, such meetings are regularly held, and there was no cessation during the Deputies' stay. Teachers have been sent out at various times from among these people to the surrounding tribes, and at that very time a subscription was being raised to meet the expenses of two of their number to be sent out in the autumn when the people are at their villages; the Deputies made no enquiry, and as there was no bell-ringing or noise about all this, of course they heard nothing. We leave it to our readers to imagine what was the spirit which must have actuated the Deputies, when throughout their report

they refuse to recognize the position these Indians have assumed as members of an Independent Native Church, and persistently speak of them as Mr. Duncan's Indians, as if Mr. Duncan had set himself up to be the head of a new sect or church. If such had been his intention he would have acted very differently from the way he has done. His desire is best expressed in the words of Gideon, "I will not rule over you, but the Lord shall rule over you," and the attempt of the Society to fasten upon these people a denominational title opposed to the very principles upon which they have formed themselves into a Christian community, is only an exhibition of their vexation at being detected in an attempt to hinder this really laudable effort.

The Deputies are strong in their denunciation of Mr. Duncan for upholding the Indian title to the land; Mr. Duncan is not by any means the first or the greatest advocate for the recognition of this title, as will be seen from the following extract from a speech of Lord Dufferin when Governor-General of Canada, delivered at Victoria in 1876, "Now, we must all admit that the condition of the Indian question in British Columbia, is not satisfactory. Most unfortunately, as I think, there has been initial error ever since Sir James Douglas quitted office, in the Government of British Columbia neglecting to recognize what is known as the Indian title. In Canada this has always been done; no Government, whether provincial or central, has failed to acknowledge that the original title to the land existed in the Indian tribes and communities that hunted or wandered over them. Before we touch an acre we make a treaty with the chiefs representing the lands we are dealing with, and having agreed upon and paid the stipulated price, oftentimes arrived at after a great deal of haggling and difficulty, we enter into possession, but not until then do we consider that we are entitled to deal with an acre." And again further on, "Now I confess I consider that our Indian fellow-subjects are entitled to exactly the same civil rights, under the laws, as are possessed by the white population, and that if an Indian can prove a prescriptive right of way to a fishing station, or a right of way of any other kind, that that right should no more be ignored than if it was the case of a white man. I am well aware that amongst the coast Indians the land question does not present the same characteristics as in other parts of Canada, or as it does in the grass countries of the interior of the Province, but I have also been able to understand that in these latter districts it may be even more necessary to deal justly and liberally with the Indian in re-

gard to his land rights even than on the Prairies of the North West."

Lord Dufferin's views on the Indian land question as set forth in the foregoing extracts are fully confirmed by legal opinion obtained both from Dominion and Provincial lawyers. The Society in speaking of their adherents at p. 664, say, "They are 100 in number and have hitherto been supposed to be one tenth of the entire community, this estimate does not appear to be quite accurate as we are now informed (hearsay again) that the total number does not exceed 600 instead of being 1000 as previously reported." The population of Metlakahtha according to an enumeration which has just been made is as follows; adherents of the Society (including boarders in the Mission House, although some of these do not properly belong to Metlakahtha) 94, members of the Native Church 854, total 948. From this it will be seen how inaccurate the information is on which the Society rely and how ready they have been to accept what ever seemed to favor themselves or disparage these people, *ex hoc uno disce omnes*.

Towards the conclusion of the Article in the *Intelligencer* reference is made to the agents and adherents of the C. M. S. at Metlakathla at p. 677. We find the following passage from Bishop Ridley's last Annual report. "The spirit of prayer that sprang up amid our misfortunes has been steadily maintained. The persevering attention to the consecutive reading and exposition of the Gospels has edified the hearers in a marked manner. 'We had some links,' said one intelligent man when the reading of St. Matthew was complete; 'now we have the chain.' Another remarked at the same time. 'We saw through a narrow slit; now the door is wide open, we see the whole picture.' These are the results to be expected from a larger knowledge of Holy Scripture. The little band of youths at the Mission house at Metlakahtha are making satisfactory progress. It is the first serious effort to steadily and systematically instruct Indians. They bid fair to be a seed-plot for the future pastors and teachers of native growth." Following this is an extract expressing the "deliberate opinion" of the Deputies on the same subject. "After our residence among the Indians, and our informal and unrestricted intercourse with those attached to the Society, we have no hesitation in expressing the opinion that the work done among the latter, is sound and very encouraging. There is a marked contrast between those attached to the society, and the majority. The general

appearance and straightforward bearing of the former impressed us favorably, while on the other hand, we brought to the notice of Mr. Tomlinson, that the course pursued in respect to the majority, was demoralizing to their own agents." It is not our object in this reply to show how groundless are the praises here bestowed on the C. M. S. agents and adherents; but we quote a speech from one of their number, a communicant, and one of their leading members. Samuel Pelham's speech in a meeting with Metlakahtla Christians October 12th, 1886. It was at his own request that this meeting was held, and his words as afterwards written out are as follows:—

"MY BRETHREN:—Ever since we were separated I did not sleep well nor feel happy because I left you. I missed the true Christians who used to help in God's word. I often said to myself where is the old path, the path of Christian union. Above all I miss your presence in reading and talking of God's words. I say this because not one of those of our party care for things that I used to taste with you, that is talking and thinking of heavenly things or considering God's word. Whenever I ask any of our party of these things they do not know. I speak concerning our party—Who shall I ask of them? Will Donald give an answer if I ask him of God's word? I tell you not one of them ever thinks of such things except Matthew—sometimes he and I have a little talk about God's word. I speak to you now because I know you have no bad feelings to me, I know all of you, and I want that love that I missed so long to be restored to me again, and to join with you in the good work as before, and no more to put on the "devil face" when we meet each other. It is not only myself I am speaking about, but the rest of my family who are still with the party we belong to, that all of us may again feel that happiness that we have tasted when we first came here. I know that many of you are striving for the same good work and considering God's words, but on our side none of them ever do such things. I feel this feeling working in me for quite a time, and I cannot refrain from telling you what God has put in my heart to tell you."

Such are his words, yet he still continues with his party, so it is not for us to comment upon them. Before we conclude we cannot help referring to a matter which has been so presented to their readers by the Society as possibly to mislead them, I refer to the position assumed by the Society as the defenders of religious liberty at Metlakahtla. Now

how will such an assumption be borne out by the facts. Years ago a small body of Native converts under the direction of an European Missionary drew up certain rules, and agreed that both themselves and any who might join them should obey these rules. To avoid interfering with others or being interfered with themselves, they chose a site for a settlement, and the condition of becoming a settler on this site was a promise to obey these rules or leave. The C. M. S. knew that these rules had been made and showed their approval of them by endorsing what their Missionary had done. For years these rules were carried out in practice and drew nothing but praise from the Society, although during that time several to whom these rules were irksome had to leave the settlement. The blessing of God rested on these rules and the settlement increased and prospered. These are the same rules which the people are contending for now, and yet the Society which for so many years approved of them and applauded the Indians for maintaining them, are now their bitterest opponents. Now why is this? Neither the principles on which these rules are founded nor the rules themselves have changed, then why the opposition from the C. M. S.? Because the Society has changed. A few years ago, as the extracts from the Annual letters show, the single aim of the Society was the glory of God and they would have rejoiced that a body of Christians such as those at Metlakahla had the courage to form themselves into a Native Church bearing their own burdens. Now, however, the aim of the Society is twofold, and no advancement in Christianity by their Converts will satisfy them unless at the same time there be a corresponding attachment to the rites and ceremonial of the Church of England. Had Mr. Duncan been as anxious for the establishment of the Church of England among these people as he has been for simple Gospel Christianity we would still be hearing his praises sounded by the C. M. S. These Christians are only anxious to be allowed to continue in the enjoyment of the privilege of union which they believed they had secured by founding their village in the way they did. How far the C. M. S., by opposing them in this lawful and laudable demand, appear as the defenders of religious liberty, we leave to our readers to decide. In conclusion we would remark that this attempt of the C. M. S. to put a stumblingblock in the way of young disciples endeavoring to form themselves into a Christian community with rules and ceremonials based on the simple word of God and suited to their particular needs, must from its

very nature be displeasing to God and we need not wonder, should the Society persist in such a narrowminded course, if God withdraw his favor and blessing from them. Again and again the Society deplore the failure of this Mission, "how sadly," say they, "has the success of the early days been clouded over." How clouded over? Have the converts relapsed into heathenism? Have they cast aside the simple Gospel and adopted some strange form of belief? Thank God, no. They still cling to their simple faith. They would guide their lives by the light of God's own word, and obey their Lord's every command; yes, His *every* command, for it is not from ignorance, or a spirit of disobedience, but as they themselves plainly tell us from a feeling of reverence and because they realize the true object for which it was instituted, that they have postponed the introduction of the blessed rite of the Lord's Supper among them. Threatened and harassed as they have been with the whole influence of Church and State against them it is a triumph for the Gospel that they have continued united and firm in seeking by lawful means to maintain their right both as Christians and loyal British subjects, and this is what the Society is weeping over instead of rejoicing that these converts, many of whom only a few years ago were sunk in the depths of heathenism, have organized themselves into a Native Christian Church. "How the gold has become dim and the most fine gold *changed*."

ROBERT TOMLINSON.

COPIES OF CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE
DEPUTIES AND THE NATIVE CHRISTIANS
AND MR. TOMLINSON.

On Thursday the 22nd of April, 1886, the Deputies met the Native Christians of Metlakahtla in meeting for the first time and addressed them.

These addressees, as written out by the Deputies, are as follows:—

GENERAL TOUCH SAID,—

My Friends:—I wish to explain to you why we have come from England. In order to make this clear, I will explain what the Society is, and what the Committee is. The Church Missionary Society is all those persons who give us money for mission work. The account of the money is

contained in these 200 pages of this book, which is last year's report. One is published every year. The money last year was over a million dollars. The people who give this are the Society. These appoint the Committee or Council in London. The Committee have all this money sent to them, and they distribute it in different parts of the world, where the missionaries are working. We have missions in many parts—India, British North America, China, Japan, Ceylon, the Holy Land, and some other places. The Committee in London manages all the affairs of the Society. I speak as a member of the Committee as well as of the deputation. The Committee consists of twenty-four laymen, and all clergymen who give money to the Society may sit in the Committee if they please. The laymen are appointed by name, but any clergyman, by only paying money, acquires the right to sit. There is a President of the Society. The late President, Lord Chichester, who had been President 51 years, died since I left London and no new President has yet been appointed as far as I know. I have received a notice that the Committee would meet about that matter, and a new President will be appointed shortly, I do not know who he will be. I cannot tell you who all the clergymen on the Committee are, but here in the Report is a list of all the laymen. To show you what sort of people they are, I may tell you that some of them are Generals in the army, some are Barristers and Solicitors, some have been judges, one is an engineer whom I met at Liverpool on my way out and who has just finished the tunnel under the River Mersey, several are merchants; several are men who have been in the civil service in India. All are men of experience. There is only one youngish man in the Committee and he has been appointed lately. He is aged I think about 35. They are generally old men like myself of 63 or so. I will lay the book here on the table, and any one who can read English can see it, I cannot send it round because I have only one copy and have to use it, but anyone can see it at my present residence.

Now I will tell you why Mr Blackett and I are here. The best way to explain it will be to do it in regular form and read the resolution of the Committee by which we were appointed. When that Resolution was passed on Feb. 8th. I was out speaking for the Society at a town in England and so I was absent from that meeting. There are seven Secretaries, the Chief of them is Mr. Wigram, and he wrote to me this letter. "After a good discussion the Committee to day unanimously resolved. "That having regard to the great importance of putting an end to, as speedily as possible,

the long continued tension at Metlakahtla, this Committee invite General Touch and Rev. W. R. Blackett, M A. Vicar of Holy Trinity, Nottingham, to visit Metlakahtla, and to confer with the Provincial Government, the Bishop, the christians who adhere to the Society and those who have seceded with Mr. Duncan, and others, with a view to assist the Committee in determining what action should be taken." Let me explain that the Committee cannot of course *order* any persons who are not under them. But the Committee has to decide as to its own people what has to be done.

In 1853, thirty years ago, the Committee sent out Mr. Duncan to Fort Simpson. Afterwards, as you know, he removed, with the Committee's sanction, to Metlakahtla. Then he for many years did good work here under the Committee. Therefore the Committee can never help feeling an interest in all the people in Metlakahtla, whether they cleave to the Society or to any other person. The object of the Committee then in sending Mr. Duncan was to do you good, to teach you God's word, and His truth. That was the first thing. They also desire these, and always do, that the comfort of the people might be increased. We see in all the Missions that as soon as the people begin to believe the Bible and the Gospel, they become better and more true and more steady, and also more prosperous even in the things of this world. We do not want people only to come and say they are going to do so and so, but we want people who from their hearts really wish to serve God. We get nothing by our Mission work, except that we think we are doing God's work. And if people trust us with a million dollars it shows they believe at least that we are honest. It does not prove that we are honest, but at least it proves they *think* we are honest. When they know from year to year what we do with the money, they have some means of judging whether we are honest or not. I think you will now understand the arrangements of the Society and its work.

One thing the Committee feels strongly, that they cannot make everybody think alike. God has not made all men's faces the same. There will be difference both in faces and in opinions. It is right for each to think what he believes to be true. He is responsible to God for what he thinks, and for using all means, such as the word of God and prayer, to learn what His will is. No man has the right to say to another, "you must think so and so." God's word says "to his own master he standeth or falleth," that is to

this Com-
 kett, M A.
 kahtla, and
 a Bishop,
 those who
 with a view
 tion should
 cannot of
 But the
 hat has to

nt out Mr.
 now, he re-
 ntla. Then
 the Com-
 lp feeling
 ether they
 e object of
 s to do you

That was
 nys do, that
 We see in
 gin to be-
 better and
 erous even
 eople only
 ut we want
 erve God.

at we think
 t us with a
 at we are
 but at least
 know from
 have some
 . I think
 Society and

t they can-
 t made all
 ee both in
 nk what he
 or what he
 ord of God
 the right to
 God's word
 " that is to

God. But for the regulation of human affairs there must be some to govern, and to govern with reference to what is good, with the word for their guide. Some are foolish enough to think, it would be nice if all were allowed to do just at they like. But people of experience and wisdom know that God has directed that there should be government. Without it there would be no safety for life or property therefore every body of people have to decide under proper guidance for themselves what are the best arrangements for the good of the whole body. It is always found that some rules are necessary. To make them too many or too tight is not good. Those Nations prosper most that most respect the Word of God and carry out in its spirit the government of the country and of communities, that is, bodies, of people living together in one place.

The Committee were very sorry that trouble arose at Metlakahtla and wish as far as they properly can, to remove them. But they do not wish to do this by trying to get all their own will, but to secure what is really best for this community of Metlakahtla. Every one in Metlakahtla has the right to decide what he wishes for himself, but each cannot be sure that he will get exactly what he wishes. If there is to be any peace it must be by some general understanding and arrangement. The Committee wish to promote some arrangement on which there can be peace on proper grounds. If the grounds of peace are not good the peace will not last long. It is like getting a thin skin over a deep sore. The skin soon breaks and the sore breaks out again. What is wanted is to get the the sore out and heal that. That is the desire of the Church Missionary Society with regards to these trouble. I may notice that the word *Church* in the name of the Society means the Church of England. The Committee of the Church Missionary Society approves of the Church of England as we understand it. There are some in the Church of England who think differently from us and want to have it what is called "High Church," We are called "Low Church." The other Society the Society for the propagation of the Gospel which is a smaller Society is favoured by the High Church party. The Church Missionary Society is entrusted with more money than any other Society in England. I mention this only to show the confidence we get from the people. We may be all wrong, but you can judge for yourselves whether we are likely to be wrong. We do not want people to come and tell us what they are. If they do, we always keep it in our own power to judge what a man is. And so I expect

others not to take what I say without consideration, but to judge for themselves whether it is right.

It will not be of much use to go into the causes of these troubles now. It would be a long business. We are ready to do it. We have come to place our time at the disposal of the christians of Metlakahla. We ought to give you time to think over what we say, and not ask you to be in a hurry to say what you think. We are ready to answer any questions anybody may ask. We do not say we are able to answer every question, but our object is to give full information on any thing in which any one is interested, if we can give it and if we think it right to give it. We want you to be quite free in asking questions, we shall be quite free in telling you every thing we can tell you and ought to tell you. We tell you our only object in coming. We, agreeing with the Committee, placed ourselves at the service of the Committee, hoping to do real good to the friends in Metlakahla. We have no power from Government. The Committee could not give us any power to decide anything as a judge decides. But we can hear what everybody has to say, and can judge how far it is right or wrong. Then we can tell the Committee what has been said, and what we think about it. We have not come to take a side, to favour one and to disfavour another. But we have come to be as just as we can in forming our opinions, and to get the truth. Whether anyone likes it or does not, we cannot be guided by that.

We are only men, and we may make mistakes, but we desire not to make any. I need not say more as to our spirit in coming among you.

For myself, I have been 37 years in India, and there, as a servant of the Government, I had to judge about many different things. All I can do is to use the experience thus gained to judge in this matter also.

The causes of these troubles are of some importance, and we should truly ascertain what they are. But it is much more important that we should be able to advise what is best for the present and the future. And the friends here present and others can assist us in this if they think it right to do so. The Committee desire true and full information. We cannot, of course, take what every person says and assume that it is all true. We must shake what we are told in a sieve and see what truth remains, and then tell the Committee what we have ascertained.

I think I have said enough, because Mr. Blacket has yet to speak.

(At this point there was some discussion about going on, ultimately Gen. Touch was requested by those present to finish now all he had got to say.)

The Committee have received different reports about these matters. Those who were bound to write have written and told the Committee what they think. And Mr. Duncan's friends have written what they think. But the Committee are 7000 miles away. And one who wants to decide justly desires to judge for himself. The Committee cannot all come out here, if they could they would like to do so, but we have given up some months to do this for them. So we want to do our best to promote the Committee's object. As to the causes of the troubles I do not think it possible now to get full information on that. It would take a long time to do it well. We do not want to go back and say we have done our best, but have not done the best that could be done. We are willing to give any amount of time to get at the truth. We know that the friends here cannot give much time, they must go and do their work and look after their own interests. While you are here we want you to give us the time that is most convenient to you. We want you to think over what we say to you, and consider what is best. We want you to judge for yourselves. Every man has a right to decide, in the sight of God, in his own way. To the time of what I will call the "split" you were all Christians of the Church Missionary Society; Mr. Duncan as a Missionary of the Society, you as the sons and daughters of the Society. But you have a right to say: "Now we want to be under a different Church Government." God's word does not tell all to think alike. But it does tell us that in some things, if we do not think according to the Word, we think wrong. But in many things of less importance different people may think differently and have different arrangements. All people acknowledge this. I never was in any part of the world where it was not acknowledged. It must not be supposed that we want to use pressure or force. We only want to set before you what is best, or at least what we think best, and then leave you to decide for yourselves.

As I said, up to the time of the "split" you were sons of the Church Missionary Society. We quite understand that to you Mr. Duncan was the Church Missionary Society. We were very sorry that we and Mr. Duncan could not think alike on some points which we thought important. Any missionary has a right at any time to say: "When I entered the service of the Society, I thought so and so,

and so I understood things. But now I think differently, and therefore cannot continue to be a missionary of the Society. We should be sorry that that happened, but should feel it unjust not to allow any man to act as he believed in the sight of God to be right. Some have said so and left us; we do not quarrel with them when they do so. Rather we say to them, "We honor you for acting as you believe to be right." We do not agree with you, yet we say: "We sent you out and we will pay your expenses in coming back, so as to leave you where we found you." If they wish that, it is done. If they do not wish to come back we are ready to give them help to begin a new course of life in their own way. If they do not want such help, we do not give it. We are only anxious to deal justly. If we do not, people would not trust us.

It so happens that Mr. Duncan wrote to the Society to the effect: "I cannot do what the Church Missionary Society thinks right, because I think otherwise." We invited Mr. Duncan to talk with us before we left England. He came to the Church Missionary House, and for five and a half hours he spoke to us and told us what he thought fully. In some things we agreed with him. We told him where we did not agree with him, and we asked him to be here when we were here. He was doubtful whether he could or not, but he said he would try and would let us know. We did not hear from him before we left, but in Victoria we received a telegram stating that he had left on the 8th. This was sent by the Society for the information of Mr. Blackett and myself, so I hope he will soon be here. If Mr. Duncan is here it will help us to get to what we want, because Mr. Duncan is a principal party in the matter, and we cannot get at the whole truth unless the principal party is here. We may get as much of it as we can before he comes, and we have to use our time as best we may. We cannot tell when he will be here. We have not heard his plans. Perhaps he may come. If he does it will be very helpful. We shall see what happens, so we shall go on with our business. We will hear as much as we can. Then when Mr. Duncan comes we shall have the benefit of his presence and his help. We always regret when any divisions take place among the Christians in a small place. That is not good. There is only one thing worse, and that is for the sake of peace to do wrong. We do desire peace, and we hope we can do right and have peace. That remains to be seen. I would ask all to pray to God that He will lead all to seek for peace, and guide all to do what is

best for His glory, and for the good of the Christians in Metlakahtla. All men like to have their own will. I do, but I do not always get it, and I think it is a good thing that I do not. But we must desire something above our own will, that God may guide us, and bend our wills as may be best for His children. Since we knew we had this work to do, I may safely say that it has been our daily prayer that God will do what we cannot do—that is, that he will influence us all to do what He would like us to do. I ask all present if they think this right, to pray for this from God. Does anyone here know what is the 9th verse of the 5th chapter of the gospel according to St Matthew? “Blessed are the peace makers, for they shall be called the children of God.” It is not blessed are they who quarrel and fight. The Bible does not say: Let wrong continue rather than contend. St. Paul says we must contend for what is right as concerns God, and not contending for our own wills. And we have to keep that before us. Let us ask God to enable us to do one, not to do the other. I think now that I had better conclude for this evening, for my colleague, Mr. Blackett has yet to speak. To make sure that we remember what we have said, and I shall note what he says, we want to make all correct in writing, so that we may be able to say, to the Committee: “This is what was said, judge of it.” When I have spoken to you, I had not written down beforehand what I have spoken, I did not know exactly what I would say. Only after we were told to-day we were to meet you this evening, I put down some points on which I wished to speak, but the words I have spoken have been those which came up at the moment. Of these words we shall keep a copy, so that there may be no questions, whether we said so and so or did not.

Perhaps you may find it difficult to remember all I have said, and all Mr. Blackett will say. But you will have a general idea what it is you have to think of. We shall be ready to meet you again whenever you like, and after Mr. Blackett has spoken, we shall be ready to answer any questions. If any one likes to ask any questions now here we will try and answer them. If not then at any other time, or at our own house, and do not be afraid to ask questions. What we want is to clear away all doubts out of your hearts and minds. I will now sit down.

Certified that this is a true copy of my address.

TOUCH.

(COPY.)

23rd April, 1886.

Council Room Metlakahtla, April 22nd, 1886.

Mr. BLACKETT, said:—

I shall not keep you long. Now you have been told of the Church Missionary Society. I heard in India a story of a great Giant who had no head but had such long arms that he could embrace any who came within a mile of him. The Church Missionary Society has a head and such long arms that it can embrace people on this side of the world and on the other side of the world too. The Church Missionary Society embraces you, not as though it claimed or desired to exercise any power whatever over you. But it feels the deepest interest in you and desires that you should be saved eternally and that God should be glorified in you. The proof that the Church Missionary Society cares for you and loves you is that they sent out first Mr. Duncan, and then others to preach the Gospel and to do you good. It was therefore grieved when troubles came among you. It was very much grieved when you were separated from the Society, it could not help, even after the separation caring for you. If a child leaves its father's house and will not live as one of his family, the father grieves over that child, and the proof that the Society still cares for you is that it has sent out us to talk to you.

The particular instruction we have is to hear everything everybody has to say. We want to hear all you have to say. Whether you say it together or separately, we cannot promise to agree with you in all you say, but our business is to hear everything you wish to say, tell us everything you think we ought to know.

The great thing the Committee desire is that all should live in peace. You know many texts of scripture, one is "as much as lieth in you live peaceably with all men" that is God's Command mark. "With all men." It does not say to live peaceably with those who agree with you in everything. If two people want to go the same place there will not be much difference in the direction they will go. We all want to go to Heaven and if that is our desire there will not be much disputing as to the exact way we walk in. A man may go a little to the right or a little to the left of the road I go in but I shall not quarrel with him on that account nor he with me. When we do live peaceably with all men, we find that we don't differ so much as we think. An-

other man and I can go to Heaven even if we don't walk side by side.

We ought to follow the example of our Lord Jesus Christ and He loved all men. Even if they did not agree with Him. We desire peace but the foundations must be love, and there is no true Christianity where there is not love. Love calls out love in others, therefore let us ask God to give us all love so that when we discuss these matters we may do so in love and if we have love in our hearts we shall find a way to live peaceably with all men. We want you to tell us every thing you think you ought to tell us. Pray to God and let us look up to Him for help and we shall find a way to put an end to all these troubles.

I certify this to be a true account of what was said by me at the meeting on Thursday Evening, April 22nd 1886, to the Indians of Metlakahtla.

April 23rd. 1886.

(Signed) W. R. BLACKETT.

After receiving these documents the people held several meetings and when they had fully considered them the following reply was drawn up and handed to the Deputies.

METLAKAHTLA, April 27th 1886.

DEAR SIR:

We, the people of Metlakahtla, in meeting assembled have heard your speeches which you kindly wrote out at our request, translated to us, and after hearing them we have decided not to give any answer, for the following reasons: 1st. You say you have no authority from the Society to settle anything, but only to make enquiry and hear opinions. 2nd. We do not think anything would be gained by going over everything, when we have already told the Society in our letters what our troubles are. 3rd. We have not asked the Society to send you. We did ask them when our troubles first began to send a deputation to enquire into matters, but they refused. 4th. Two of our number went with Mr. Duncan as delegates to Ottawa last spring, and had an interview with Sir John Macdonald when they presented our letter. He promised to consider the whole matter and send us an answer. We have not yet received this letter, and it would hardly be fair to make any settlement without awaiting his reply.

But while we do not see reason to enter into any discussion, or waste our time in fruitless talkings, we wish to

bring before you in a few words the real state of the case, which you have not so much as referred to in your speeches, and to ask the Society two questions.

Metlakahtla, including the two acres, was Tsimshean land and the site of an old village, before ever Mr. Duncan left England. The first Tsimsheans who wished to serve God showed this place to Mr. Duncan as a good site for an Indian village. There never was the smallest idea of taking it or any part of it from thus. We were willing and glad for the Missionaries of the Society to occupy the two acres as long as we felt they were working for us, but we never supposed the Society would try and take these two acres from us, and claim them because they had their buildings on them, any more than we supposed that Mr. Duncan would want to take from us the pieces of land on which he erected the saw-mill and other works. We were no parties to the arrangement between the Government and the Society about the two acres. We feel that the Society is not working for us any longer, but is opposing and hindering us, and we wish them to move off our land. We ask the Society this question: Will the Society in consideration of our prior claim to the land, and our earnest request, give up their claim and yield to this our unanimous wish?

The reason for the first Christians leaving Fort Simpson and coming to Metlakahtla to form a Christian community of members from any of the many surrounding tribes. Those who came were to give up their tribal and other distinctions, and live as one people united, and binding themselves each one to follow the rules laid down from time to time by their council. So that unity was the basis of the settlement. The coming of each was voluntary, his stay was voluntary, and he could leave if ever he found the rules irksome.

Before the separation the Society told us they wished to make some changes and bring us into direct connection with the Church of England. We did not want these changes and when the Society found we did not want to change they dismissed Mr. Duncan because he would not try to make us do what they wanted. We all, without any exception asked Mr. Duncan to stay here among us. After some months, a few separated from us. They had a right to leave us if they chose but not to remain at Metlakahtla after they had separated from us, because they had promised to be one with us. It is not that these few have left us that causes the trouble but that they are being supported by the Society in doing what they ought not to do. What we wish to ask the

Society is this. Will the Society refuse to hear our earnest entreaty, and in opposition to our unanimous wish continue to support the direct cause of the dissension and disunion among us, or will they not rather listen to our prayer and withdraw their support and thus put an end to the trouble and enable us to return to the old paths and again enjoy that union which was such a blessing to us and those around us?

From the people of Metlakahla and signed for them by

DAVID LEASK, SECRETARY.

MAJ. GEN. J. TOUCH.

REV. W. R. BLACKETT.

Metlakahla.

When the Deputies had fully considered the Indians' letter, they asked to meet the people again, when they read the following, which was then handed to the Indians:—

METLAKAHTLA, British Columbia,

April 30th 1886.

DEAR FRIENDS:

We have received your letter of 27 April, 1886. In it you tell us that after having heard what we said to you on Thursday evening, April 22nd, translated to you, you had decided not to give any answer. For this you give four reasons. These reasons we wish to notice in order.

1st. Because we have no authority from the Society to settle anything, but only to make enquiry and hear opinions.

The word "opinion" is not quite correct. Our object is rather to ascertain facts—to obtain reliable information. It is our duty to use every means to separate what is fact from what is only opinion. We want evidence.

The power to settle its own affairs lies with the Committee of the Society. But observe this, that while we have no power to settle anything, neither do we ask you now to settle anything. We are instructed to confer with you. This is shown by the resolution read to you on Thursday. We know that the Committee hopes that after conference with you we may be able to come to an understanding with you as to what should be done. And this might enable them to decide on their course of action, in order to secure

peace either now or hereafter at Metlakabla. This is what all should decide.

2nd. You say that you do not think anything would be gained by going over everything when you have already told the Society in your letters what your troubles are.

The Society know something from your letters as to what your troubles are. But conference face to face is the best way of obtaining full information. And for the purpose of obtaining full information we have been sent out.

3rd. You say that you have not asked the Society to send us out. We had a long talk with Mr. Duncan in London. He then expressed his satisfaction at our being sent out to see you and assured us that you would receive us gladly. You did receive us on our arrival with marked cordiality and kindness. This we heartily acknowledge with our best thanks. At the meeting on Thursday the 22nd, we gave you an explanation of our mission, and we said what seemed necessary to introduce the discussion of details at future meetings. Afterwards we invited you to ask any questions you desired either then or afterwards. You thanked us, and asked for a copy of what we had said, so that you might consider it deliberately, and afterwards ask questions if you wished. We promised you a copy the next evening and through John Tait you thanked us for complying with your request. On Friday evening about half past six we delivered the promised copy to John Tait. Nothing passed between us afterwards, till we received your reply. It seems hardly to agree with what you have done already, or with the courtesy you have shown us hitherto, if you tell us now, you will give us no answer because you had not asked the Society to send us.

4th. You tell us that two of you with Mr. Duncan had an interview with Sir John Macdonald last spring, and that he then promised to consider the whole matter submitted to him in your letter. You think that it would hardly be fair to make any settlement until you receive his reply.

We quite admit that in any understanding we may come to, it might be proper to reserve any points referred to Sir John Macdonald. But we do not ask you to come to any immediate settlement. And you have already observed that we have no power to settle anything ourselves. We wish only to prepare the way for a settlement hereafter. We do not therefore feel that these reasons need stand in the way of future conference. After giving these reasons for giving no answer, you go on to bring before us your view of the real state of the case.

I. You tell us that the two acres were Tsimpsean land and part of the site of an old village before Mr. Duncan left England. You say that you never supposed the Society would try to take those two acres from you on the ground that they had their buildings on them. You state that you were no parties to the arrangement between the Government and the Society about the two acres.

We know how much importance you attached to the question of the two acres. The Secretaries of the Society therefore wrote to Sir John Macdonald and to the Government of Victoria, and told them we were coming out to inquire into all these matters. When we were in Ottawa, Sir John Macdonald was too ill to see any one on business, we dare say you know this. But he had directed his deputy to write letters to the Agent of the Dominion Government at Victoria, and to the Indian Superintendent. In these letters he requested them to give us all assistance and information, so that we might be enabled to do what we were sent out for. These letters were given to us open and we brought them to Victoria. Among the papers placed at our disposal by the officials at Victoria, we find several which bear upon the question of the two acres. We will quote here the actual words of some important decisions:

First we quote from a memorandum of the Hon^{ble} Mr. Trutch, he wrote it when he was Commissioner of Lands and Works. Governor Musgrave forwarded it with his approval to Earl Granville, Secretary of State for the Colonies in England. The letter forwarding it was dated, "Government House, British Columbia, 29th January 1870." Mr. Trutch's words are these:

* * * * * "The Indians have in fact been held to be special wards of the crown, and in the exercise of this guardianship, Government has in all cases where it has been desirable for the interests of the Indians, to set apart such portions of the Crown lands as were deemed proportionate to, and amply sufficient for, the requirements of each tribe. And these Indian reserves are held by Government in trust for the exclusive use and benefit of the Indians resident thereon. But the title of the Indians in the fee of the public lands or of any portion thereof has never been acknowledged by Government, but on the contrary is distinctly denied."

(Signed) JOSEPH W. TRUTCH.

The next record we quote is a letter of the Govern-

ment to Mr. Duncan. It is a reply to his application for the extension of the Reserve at Metlakahltla, and for a grant of two acres. It is as follows:

COLONIAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
27th September, 1864.

"Sir,—I have the honor to acquaint you with reference to your letter of the 30th May last, that the Government reserve at Metlakahltla has been, by direction of the Governor, extended to a distance of five miles each side of the Mission Point, and five miles back from the coast line.

"His Excellency has also directed that the two acres of land known as Mission Point is to be held in trust by the Government for the benefit of the Church Missionary Society.

"I have, &c.,

[Signed] "CHARLES GOOD,
"For the Col. Secretary.

"W. DUNCAN,
"Metlakahltla."

Both at Ottawa and Victoria we ascertained, from the Government officials, that the state of the law is still as shown in these papers. We quote one more extract. It is from a report of P. O'Rielly, Esq, Indian Reserve Commissioner, to the Right Honorable the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs at Ottawa. It is dated, you will observe, after your separation from the Society.

* * * "Ten miles along the coast by five miles back of this tract, which includes the village, fisheries, etc., of Metlakahltla, was in 1863 declared to be a Government reserve, no doubt intended for the Indians, though not specially so stated, and two acres within the village site of Metlakahltla was specially reserved for the Church Missionary Society.

[Signed] "P. O'RIELLY,
Indian Reserve Com'r.

You profess to live according to the Queen's laws. Indeed you are bound to do so. Now the Queen's laws secure the right of the Church Missionary Society to this land, as these extracts clearly show. The Queen's Government, which holds these two acres in trust for the Society, has declared the Society's right by having them surveyed. You will therefore see that you are bound to respect that right.

You are, then, wrong in supposing that the Society has

tried to take these two acres from you. It was quite needless to do so, as the Society holds the two acres in just the same way as you hold the Reserve. That is, the Government hold both in trust, the Reserve for you, and the two acres for the Society.

II. You say that the Society is not any longer working for you, but is opposing and hindering you. And you wish them to move off the land.

You have separated yourselves from the Society, you have, of course, a perfect right to do so if you choose. But the Society does all it can for your benefit, and will go on working for your benefit still. It does not hold Mission Point only for the benefit of those who adhere to it. It is bound to do all it can for them. But it is bound to hold Mission Point, and does hold it, for your highest benefit also. It held it at first that the word of God might be introduced among you. It holds it now in order to offer you the full benefit of the religion of Christ, which has so happily begun to take root among you. For instance—you have been deprived hitherto of the Lord's Supper. This is one of the greatest privileges of the Christian Religion, and every true Christian has a right to it. While your Christianity is in this and other respects imperfect, the Society cannot feel that its work of establishing the Gospel among you has been completed. Many of you do not at present care to accept the ministrations the Society offers to you. But that does not set free the Society from the duty of putting within your reach an unimpaired Christianity. Further the Society cannot lose sight of this, that at present you are not, as far as they know, supported by any Society. Thus they do not see any guarantee that the present state of things will be permanent among you. They feel therefore that they may at any time have to take up again that responsibility for the support of the Gospel among you which they bore for so many years.

III. You ask this question: Will the Society, in consideration of your prior claim to the land, and your earnest request, give up their claim to the land!

We must not deceive you by giving you any doubtful reply to this question. We answer that we cannot in any way advise the Committee to give up their Metlakahla mission. Nor do we for a moment believe that under any circumstances they will do so. We have already explained to you that you are wrong in supposing that you have any claim to Mission Point. The Committee have already informed Mr. Duncan, through Mr. Wigrani, the honorary

secretary, that they feel they have duties to fulfil both towards the native church, built up through the agents of this Society, and towards the members of the Society at home. We cannot therefore hold out any hope that your request will be complied with.

IV. You tell us of the circumstances under which the Mission at Metlakahtla was established. You say that the wish was to form one people, united by certain conditions, to which they voluntarily agreed. From these you say, they could be freed by leaving the place if they choose. As to these conditions, we must remind you of this, that the Mission was the Mission of the Church Missionary Society that Mr. Duncan was their agent, and that he was bound to conduct the Mission according to the instructions and rules of the Society, so long as he remained in their service. The Society do not object to such rules as are necessary for the proper conducting of a Mission. But they do object to conditions being imposed which are not consistent with the principles of God's word, which even the law of the land rejects, and which considerations of what is called "General Policy," (that is, of what is good for all the people, declared to be bad) For uniformity is not unity. And enforced uniformity in matters in which neither God's word nor wise men require all men to think and act exactly alike, can produce only insincerity and discord. The principle adopted among you is that Religious Unity is necessary to civil unity. This the Society cannot sanction, nor give way to. It is contrary to the Spirit of God's word. And you know that the results of your attempting to apply it has been condemned by the Government Commission which held an enquiry here in November, 1884. The law of the land condemns these conditions. That people have voluntarily agreed to them does not make it lawful to enforce penalties, or to drive people away from their homes for the conscientious breach of them.

V. You remark that before the separation the Society told you they wished to make some changes, and to bring you into direct connection with the Church of England. This is a mistake on your part. The Society is a Church of England Society. It sent out Mr. Duncan as a member of the Church of England. It always required him to teach you and conduct the service in the mission according to the general principles of the Church of England, which it believes to be scriptural. For the Church of England solemnly disclaims all authority in matters of faith save that of the Word of God. Thus there was no change on the Society's part. But the Committee found that in some things

Mr.
Ch
tol
pa
the
Sa
per
an
bra
for
to
Lo
thi
Ch
dis
you

do
sal
can
nee
out
acc
Soc
to t
ject
wh
Lo
or t
bra
we
us
and
Soc

Soc
age
bee
our
The
div
in v
acc
form
tran

Mr. Duncan did not recognize or obey the principles of the Church of England, as they understood them. Specially, he told them himself that none of you had been admitted to partake of the Lord's supper. Yet some of you, he told them, had been true Christians for many years. Now, our Saviour commands His people to partake of the Lord's Supper. You may see the command in I Corinthians xi, 21, and in other places. He says plainly, "this do in remembrance of me." The Committee had a very great respect for Mr. Duncan, but they felt that they could not allow him to and in the way of your obeying this command of the Lord, nor could they permit him to forbid your receiving this, which is the privilege and right of every faithful Christian. Thus they were compelled, most reluctantly, to disconnect him from their service, in order to secure for you your full rights as Christians.

VI. On one point, it appears from your letter that you do not fully understand the facts. Mr. Duncan was paid a salary by the Society, year by year, from 1857, when he came out to you at Fort Simpson, to 1881, when his connection with the Society was severed. The Society also sent out money besides this for the expenses of the Mission; according to the rules, and to the actual practice of the Society, all money given for the Society's Mission belongs to the Society, not to the Missionaries; all such money is subject to the control of the Committee; it makes no difference whether the money is paid into the Society's treasury in London, or given to any of its agents for special purposes, or to any Missionary by friends at home or abroad for any branch of the work carried on by the Missionaries. This we can both of us state from our personal knowledge. One of us has learned it as a member of the Committee at home and abroad for many years, and the other as an agent of the Society, and as an acting Secretary for a time.

Mr. Duncan collected money from the friends of the Society and as he tells us, from others also. But as our agent he collected that money for our Mission; if he had not been our agent, the money would not have been given for our Mission, and he had no authority to collect for any other. The following is one of the Society's rules. "Every individual connected with the Society in its different Missions, in whatever department of labor shall keep a detailed and accurate account of the funds placed at his disposal, in the form that may be pointed out to him; and shall regularly transmit such accounts to the Parent Committee, or to their

representatives at the Mission, at such period as may be specified for that purpose."

Mr. Duncan then ought to have accounted for all money received by him for this mission, whether for Church, school, sawmills, or other purposes. (The Cannery was established after the severance, and does not therefore come under the rule.) Part of the expenses of the other works came from trade profits; but these profits belong to the Society, since the industries were part of the Society's Mission work for your benefit. Mr. Duncan's good management made them more than pay their expenses. If there had been loss on the whole work, the Committee would have acknowledged their responsibility for making up that loss.

A Missionary's whole time belongs to the Society, according to the agreement between him and the Society. And even if a Missionary gives his own money to help the Mission, it becomes thereon the property of the Society and not that of the giver. For instance, Mr. Wigram, the Honorary Secretary of the Society, has recently given fifty thousand dollars for a particular purpose in connection with the Society. This at once becomes the property of the Society for that purpose, and ceases to be Wigram's own money.

VII. We were sent out to confer with you that we might have every means of ascertaining the truth, and we rely on you to give us your help in doing so. We desire to conduct our enquiry in a spirit friendly to all. We are bound to get the best evidence as to facts we can. We have heard some things, but we should like to hear what you have to say as well as others. It is a principal of law and justice that if the best evidence is withheld by any party, less satisfactory evidence may be admitted. And it will remain then for those who give money to support the work to form their own conclusions as to the actual state of the case.

VIII. We should have much desired that Mr. Duncan should have been present when we met and spoke with you. You know that we have done our best to secure his presence. As he is expected here shortly he will see what we have said. And we shall be ready to meet him, with you, and discuss with him any matters referred to here by us, which he may desire to bring forward. If he does not arrive before we have to leave we shall be very sorry.

IX. In conclusion we would ask you to consider carefully one question. We all want peace; true, scriptural and

permanent peace. You have learned by experience that some of your regulations for the government of your community have brought you into conflict with the law of the land. You must see that it will be impossible in the long run to carry out such regulations. The longer the contest continues the more clearly you will learn this. If you examine the word of God, you will find that it lends no countenance to the attempt to override by rules the consciences of your fellow Christians.

We would therefore ask you, solemnly, and most kindly, whether you will not cease to impose, or attempt to enforce, such regulations as your, brethren and fellow Christians cannot conform to without doing violence to their consciences.

Nothing more than this, we believe, is required, to restore peace and harmony at Metlakahltla.

[Signed]

TOUCH.

W. R. BLACKETT.

April 30th, 1886.

To Mr. David Leask,

For the Indians of Metlakahltla attached to Mr. Duncan.

The people had much difficulty in restraining themselves during the reading of this paper, and the manifest unfairness of attacking Mr. Duncan in his absence, when they might have brought up the charge at their interview with him in London, so exasperated them that several left the meeting. At the close of the address Mr. Tomlinson charged the Deputies with making a cowardly attack with the intent to injure Mr. Duncan in the eyes of the people, and he characterized the charge as a base and groundless slander. The Deputies said they imputed no motives. Mr. Tomlinson replied that it was not a question of motives at all. The words contained a charge of fraud or breach of trust on the part of Mr. Duncan, and he would not sit there and hear an honored servant of God thus slandered.

Two days afterwards the Deputies proposed to Mr. Tomlinson that they should withdraw part of what they had said. This Mr. Tomlinson would not accept, and the following day two letters were received from the Deputies. These and a reply from Mr. Tomlinson are as below:

METLAKAHTLA, May 3rd, 1886.

DEAR FRIENDS:

Mr. Tomlinson tells us that he understands a part of

our letter read to you last Friday as implying a charge of fraud against Mr. Duncan. This is entirely a mistake, and we trust none of you will be misled by it. The terms of the letter imply no such charge, and we do not think that reasonable men would so interpret them.

We quoted certain rules and practices of the Society concerning accounts with its agents. These are facts within our own knowledge. It is quite possible that Mr. Duncan may not have been acquainted with them. Perhaps he was not even asked for any accounts. This we do not know, but we know that the rules exist. We quoted them only to show as we stated, that the Mission with all connected with it, was the mission of the Church Missionary Society. We have no suspicion whatever that Mr. Duncan mis-used or in any way misapplied the funds entrusted to his care. On the contrary we believe that he used them strictly and wisely for your benefit, and in a manner probably which the Society would heartily approve. But this does not alter the fact that those funds came to him as an agent of the Church Missionary Society. On this subject we felt that we had to remove a misapprehension from your minds.

However these are all matters relating to the past, and have not much bearing on the question for the present. That question is simply this: Whether you will for the future, in accordance with the word of God, "Live peaceably with all men," especially with your brethren who do not in all things agree with you.

(Signed)

TOUCH

W. R. BLACKETT.

To Mr. David Leask,

For the Christian Indians at Metlakahla, attached to Mr. Duncan.

(COPY.)

METLAKAHLA, 3rd May, 1866.

DEAR MR. TOMLINSON:

Adverting to what you said at the meeting on Friday evening, and to what passed at our interview yesterday, we have written to David Leask, as the representative of the Indians, disavowing any intention of imputing unworthy motives to Mr. Duncan, and assuring them that we have no suspicion of anything of the kind. We are quite willing to be judged by the actual terms of our letter, but as you informed us that they did look upon the letter as reflecting on

his character, we thought it well to adopt this obvious means of removing, if possible, the misapprehension.

We are, yours very truly,

D. G. TOUCH,
W. R. BLACKETT.

The Rev. R. TOMLINSON,
Metlakahltla.

(COPY.)

METLAKANTLA, May 4, 1886.

DEAR SIR:

I have seen your letter to David Leask explaining the sense in which you wish your words respecting Mr. Duncan's management of the Society's funds to be understood. As you have adopted this formal manner of contradicting what, to the people and myself, seemed to be the plain meaning we gladly accept your interpretation. At the same time I cannot help feeling surprised and grieved that on a point of so much importance you are so ignorant as not even to know whether the Society asked for any accounts, and that without taking the least pains to enlighten yourselves you gave utterance in a public meeting to a statement which had you examined into the matter, you would have known to be unfounded.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT TOMLINSON.

MAJOR GENERAL TOUCH,
REV. W. R. BLACKETT,
Metlakahltla.

After the receipt of these letters the people held several meetings to consider them and the Deputies' address of 30th April, and finally a reply was drawn up and handed to the Deputies, as also a notice to the Society to leave the two acres.

Mr. Tomlinson also drew up a letter shewing that in past years the Society had no desire to force the Church of England on their converts.

The Documents are as follows:—

(COPY.)

METLAKANTLA, BRITISH COLUMBIA,
May 4th, 1886.

DEAR SIR:—

In your first interview with us you would have misled

us into the belief that you had come from the Society seeking reliable information to enable them to decide upon a course of action. Your second communication shews us that this was not the intention of the Society, for they had already made up their minds as to how they would act in the only two matters which really concerned us and them, and stood in the way of peace being restored. So that any discussion of matters in conference would have been so much waste time.

You tell us the Society will not give up the two acres, and you refer us to some "decisions," as you are pleased to call them, but what are in reality only the opinions of individual Government officers, and then boldly assert we can have no claim on these two acres. The God of Heaven, who created man upon earth, gave this land to our forefathers, some of whom once lived on these very two acres, and we have received the land by direct succession from them. No man-made law can justly take from us this the gift of Him who is the source of all true law and justice. Relying on this, the highest of all titles, we claim our land and notify the Society, through you its deputies, to move off the two acres.

But you tell us it is not only to maintain the Society's claim to the two acres that they refuse to leave Metlakahla. They wish to continue the division among us. The Society, you tell us, cannot sanction the principle adopted by us, that "Religious unity is necessary to civil unity," and even dare tell us that this principle is contrary to God's word. How you can reconcile this last assertion with the history of God's people of old, as recorded in God's word, and with other portions of the blessed scriptures, we are at a loss to imagine. You stand forth as the champion of disunion, civil and religious.

Ever since the disruption we have been credited with being the cause of the existence and continuance of the dissension among us. Now, at last, the truth has come to light, and it is clear to all men that to the Society, and to the Society alone, belongs this proud distinction. For by leaving Metlakahla the Society can at once and completely put an end to the dissention. For unity we came here. For unity we remained here. And for unity we are prepared to contend to the last. God inclined our hearts, while we were still in the midst of the strifes and divisions at our old heathen villages, to accept this principle. God has blessed us acting on this principle, and God will help and defend us contending for this principle.

Y
never,
It is
teacher
it, but
Society
butions
Gospel.
animals
right o
help of
If not,
such rig
Ag
England
land wh
ward to
times b
yet non
first tim
when th
introduc
England
land, or
pendent
ies in ac
Our stat
to make
the Chu
this upon
dance w
only sho
position
You
It is not
Society a
us hesitat
blessed I
pect for
mixed up
good tim
consider
the way
Agai
nection w
the prese

You say we have departed from the Society. We never, by any promise or agreement, joined the Society. It is quite true the Society sent out and supported our teachers. We remember this and feel grateful to them for it, but this does not bring us into connection with the Society. The money was not the Society's, but the contributions of Christians to God to aid in the spread of his Gospel. Does the society for the prevention of cruelty to animals, which is also supported by contributions, claim any right over or connection with those animals which, by the help of their paid agents, they have rescued from torture. If not, why should the Church Missionary Society claim any such right in or connection with its converts?

Again you speak to us as if we had left the Church of England. We were not asked to join the Church of England when we came to Metlakantla nor when we came forward for Baptism. Though we were visited at various times by ministers of that church who baptised many of us, yet none of these asked us to join the Church of England. The first time we were asked to join the Church of England was when the Society decided that the Lord's supper must be introduced among us with the ceremonial of the Church of England. At once we objected to join the Church of England, or any other denomination, preferring to be an independent Native Church with power to regulate our ceremonies in accordance with God's word and as best suited our needs. Our statement in our former letter that the Society proposed to make changes and bring us into direct connection with the Church of England and that it was the attempt to force this upon us which caused the disruption is simply in accordance with the facts, and your attempt to explain it away only shows how ignorant you are of these facts and the position assumed by the Society in the matter.

You say we have been deprived of the "Lord's Supper." It is not so. No one has ever done this. The way the Society and its agents have been and are acting has made us hesitate to adopt the rite. Not from forgetfulness of our blessed Lord's Command, but because through love and respect for Him we would not let this His precious gift be mixed up in the controversy. When our God, in his own good time, has restored us to unity and peace, we can consider the subject and introduce the rite among us in the way most nearly according with what is written.

Again, you tell us that because we are not in connection with any other society you see no guarantee that the present state of things will be permanent. We see the

highest guarantee in such beautiful promises as that which was a source of such comfort to St. Paul when he says "My God shall supply *all* your need," and while we recognise the truth that God often uses human means, have the highest warranty of scripture that he is not only *not* dependent on them but sometimes even refuses to use them. Your reflection on Mr. Duncan's conduct while in connection with the Society, excited in us a feeling of painful surprise that two Christians sent out by a Christian Society could come all the way from England, and in his absence, try to damage the character of one whose service God has so signally acknowledged. In your letter of yesterday you have, we are happy to say, explained a part of what you originally said, but you still cling to your unfounded assertion that we are indebted to the Society and not to Mr. Duncan for the existence of the various industries established among us. We *know* better and so their assertion goes for nothing.

You say the Society still cares for us and is anxious to do all it can for our benefit. How has it shown its interest in us? By bringing ships of war and Government officials to overawe us, by dragging us before courts and magistrates, by fining and imprisoning some of us, by upholding and supporting everything they have seen to be objectionable to us, and by refusing to do any one thing we asked for. We do not call this love and care but persecution.

By distinctly refusing to give up our land or remove from Metlakahla the Society has taken away the need to further discuss matters, and we wish this letter to close the correspondence.

We believe the time for conferring about or discussing matters has passed, and the time for deciding how best we can obtain the object we have in view has arrived.

From the people of Metlakahla and signed for them
by

(Signed) DAVID LEASK.

MAJ. GEN. J. S. TOUCH,
REV. W. R. BLACKBUT.
METLAKAHLA.

(COPY.)

METLAKAHTLA, BRITISH COLUMBIA,
May 4th, 1886.

To the Church Missionary Society of Salisbury Square, London, England, its Deputies Agents, and all others who may have power to act for it.

NOTICE

We, the people of Metlakahtla hereby notify you to move off and leave that part of the village site of Metlakahtla, commonly known as Mission Point, as we cannot consent to you occupying this portion of our land to be a continued source of disquiet and annoyance to our village.

(Signed)

for the people of Metlakahtla,
DANIEL NEASHKUMKGEN
JOHN TAIT
ROBERT HEWSU
THOMAS NEASHLAHPSP.

METLAKAHTLA, May 4th 1886.

DEAR SIR:

In the accompanying letter of the Indians, I find the statement that "they had never been asked to join the Church of England." It might well be a question how this could be consistent with the fact that from first they had been under the instruction of those who were members of the Church of England and sent out by the Society as such. As one who was for many years a missionary of the Society and for some eleven of those years the only ordained missionary attached to the Society's North Pacific mission, I would beg leave to lay before you some quotations from the Society's annual letters to the missionaries, from which it will appear that such a result was not only compatible with consistency on the part of the missionaries, but even in direct harmony with the views of the Society at the time. These quotations are marked A. B. C., and are from the annual letters of 1876, 1877, 1878. To these I add an extract from a letter of mine to the Committee dated Ankihlta, August 28th, 1882, written before I left the Society. It is marked D. This extract is but an epitome of the principles which actuated me while in connection with the Society. Nothing was introduced which was in any way contrary to the doctrine and practice of the Church of England. While at the same time we always considered the native Christians had the right to choose

whenever they wished to do so, such rules, orders, and ceremonials as were consistent with the word of God and for their benefit.

Of course it was understood that whenever they did so they would be forming themselves into an Independent Native Church, and must not count upon further help from the Society.

We followed the example of the Apostle Paul. Himself a member of the Jewish Church, and sent out by that Church, but establishing Independent Native Churches at the various scenes of his labors.

Yours sincerely,

ROBT. TOMLINSON.

MAJOR GENERAL J. G. TOUCH,
REV. W. R. BLACKETT.

QUOTATIONS.

Church Missionary House, London, September, 1876.

ANNUAL LETTER TO MISSIONARIES.

A.

"The time seems to have come when Native Christian independence may be still further extended, when the Native Church may not only draw still less upon European resources than it does at present, but when by assuming a more distinctly native character, it may exercise a more powerful attraction on the heathen population by which it is surrounded. We would therefore suggest that Missionaries should represent this subject to their native brethren, especially to the leading Laymen amongst them. Let the idea become familiar with them, let the Lay delegates of the Church Councils have it frequently brought before them and should any circumstances arise indicating the advantage of Church independence let the Church Committees and district and federal Church Councils at once take action. A general request from Native Christians in any Mission for an independent native Church would be irresistible."

Church Missionary House, London, October 1st, 1877.

ANNUAL LETTER TO MISSIONARIES.

B.

"But while as members of the Church of England the Committee and the Society generally desire to act in strict obedience to the laws of that Church, as well as in con-

"formity to its spirit they must protest against the same
 "restrictions being imposed on those Native Christians
 "in various foreign countries, whom it has pleased God
 "to bring to the profession of faith in Christ through the
 "Society's instrumentality.

"What the Committee wish to see in these converts is not
 "submission to the Church of England, but the desire
 "for, and ultimately the attachments to, an *Independent Native Church*."

"The Society's object is the Glory of God in the evangel-
 "ization of the heathen and not the aggrandizement of
 "the English Church. At the same time they regard
 "it as more honorable to the Church of England to be
 "the Mother of independent children *than to be the Mis-*
 "tress of subject communities."

Church Missionary House, London, Oct. 1st, 1878.

ANNUAL LETTER TO THE MISSIONARIES.

"This independence of European help will necessarily in-
 "volve independence of coercive European control. Of
 "this we must not be afraid. Our object is *not* the ex-
 "tension of the English Church. In many fields such
 "an object would be unattainable. * * * The
 "connection therefore between the Church of England
 "and those native congregations which have been form-
 "ed through the labors of the Church Missionary So-
 "ciety's Missionaries must be regarded as provisional
 "and temporary. The ultimate relation will resemble,
 "probably, that which is cherished in the Protestant
 "Episcopal Church of the United States, fraternal or even
 "filial affection, but not the smallest approach to su-
 "bordination."

Aukilittart, August 28th, 1882.

LETTER OF REV. R. TOMLINSON TO C. M. S. COMMITTEE.

"My effort among these poor people from the first has been
 "to teach them the simple Gospel, to lead them to
 "study their Bibles, to encourage and help them to rise
 "out of their physical as well as moral degradation, and
 "to advance their temporal interests. I studiously
 "avoided drawing their attention to Church or Sectarian
 "divisions or dissensions, and aimed chiefly at uniting
 "them in the closest bonds to fight against heathenism
 "and those temptations which their position exposes
 "them to."

The reply of the Deputies to Mr. Tomlinson's two letters of the 4th together with a further letter from him concludes this correspondence.

(COPY.)

Metlukahtla, May 20th, 1886.

DEAR SIR:

We have deffered a reply to your to letters until we had an interview with Mr. Duncan, and now we desire to remove certain misapprehensions which these letters disclose. First referring to that which is a reply to ours of the 8rd inst. we observed that you have misunderstood our statement regarding the application for accounts. The allegation we made was that the rules of the Society required Mr. Duncan to render accounts of the money he collected for the church, the stores, and the industries, as well as other operations of the Mission, in refutation of statements made before the Government Commission and apparently believed by the Indians. We were aware that accounts had been furnished in connection with certain operations of the Mission, but on taking over the books of the Society from Dr. Praeger, at Victoria, under instructions from Salisbury Square we found that the twelve leaves of one of the Society's Books which from the index we learned contained the accounts of "the secular fund" had been cut out and we were not aware whether that account had been rendered or whether at any time during the years since 1857 it had been called for. We wrote at Victoria for information, and all the original account rendered reached us by the last mail, neither the accounts of the secular fund nor of any of the industries appears to be included.

The statement we made was not based on the fact that the accounts were or were not tendered or called for, but on the rule which required that they should be rendered, and it was not therefore as you supposed unfounded. The fact alleged is unquestionable.

Adverting to your other letter of the 4th inst., which accompanied the letter from the Indians of that date, we observe that you have misunderstood the purport of the extracts from the annual (circular?) letters, appended to your letter under reply. You will see by the terms of these extracts that they are designed to encourage the development of Independence in the native churches, and you have apparently overlooked the very important fact that the independence encouraged is that of the converts gathered out from among the heathen whom the Society desire to see self-supporting and self-governing, and not of the European

Missionary in their employ, who is of course under the same obligation as when he entered the service of the Society, whatever may be the condition of the native church. No native church, which has to be governed by foreign missionaries and supported, even in part, by external aid, has attained the condition referred to. You will also observe that in referring to the organization of native churches in the Society's Missions, the letters contemplate Church Committees, district and Federal Church councils, etc., with a number of native pastorates and native pastors, as at present existing, in the more advanced missions under the Church Missionary Society, and not a mission in the condition of the Metlakahtha Mission, in which there is no ordained native pastor. However incipient may be the condition of a body of native converts, the Society cannot prevent them from leaving the Society if they choose, but such an unusual contingency is not contemplated. The letter of the Indians expresses a wish that it should close the correspondence, and its tone and tenor, which we greatly regret, render it advisable to comply with that wish.

We are, yours, very truly,

[Signed]

J. TOUCH,

W. R. BLACKETT.

REV R. TOMLINSON,
Matlakahtha.

June 2nd, 1886.

DEAR SIRS:

The ground which you appear to take in yours of the 20th ultimo, as regards the accounts is: "That the rule of the Society required Mr. Duncan to render accounts of the money he collected for the Church, the Stores, the Industries, as well as other operations of the missionary." You speak of the rule of the Society, but you do not say when it was made or how long it has been in force. If the rule was in force when Metlakahtha was founded, then the whole conduct of the Committee and Secretaries of the Society for over twenty years in approving of these works and industries, and yet never once asking for accounts of expenditure on them while they regularly received and accepted the accounts for all Society's money expended during those years, shows that the rule did not refer to such industries at all.

But if the rule you refer to is of later date, then the Committee and Secretaries kept it a profound secret, and now more than three years after Mr. Duncan has left the

Society, it is brought to light for the first time. It seems unnecessary to discuss the matter further, as when you return to London where the accounts are, and consult with those who were responsible, you will see that the position you have assumed is simply untenable. As regards the extracts from the annual letters which I appended to my letter of the 4th ult., your position seems to be this, as far as I can understand it. You admit the letters were intended to encourage independence in the native churches, but you say that they in no way sanctioned the idea that these churches continue to receive any pecuniary help from the Society, or that the European missionaries could be the heads of these independent native churches, and yet continue in the pay of the Society. This is exactly what we contend the letters do mean, and it is what has occurred at Metlakahla. The native Christians have decided to form an Independent Native Church. They expected all pecuniary help from the Society to be discontinued, and were prepared to bear their own burdens. The formation of an Independent Native Church by the native Christians, while it did not alter the position of any missionary at Metlakahla towards the Society, it necessitated his deciding whether he would, at the request of these Christians give up the Society and his salary and become their minister, or continue a missionary of the Society and seek that sphere of labor the Society might point out. In neither case did it justify the Society or him in opposing or thwarting the action of these Native Christians.

When you have an opportunity of reading the letters in full from which the extracts were taken, you will be able to judge how little the reference to the Church Councils, etc., which only occurs in one letter has to say to the matter as a whole, although you seem to base on it the idea that the letters cannot refer to Christians in the condition of those at Metlakahla.

Yours sincerely,

ROBT. TOMLINSON.

General J. G. TOUCH,

Rev. W. R. BLACKETT,

POSTSCRIPT.

METLAKAHLA, Jan. 31st, 1887.

Since writing the above, the printing of which has been unexpectedly delayed, my attention has been called to a paragraph in the C. M. S. *Intelligencer* for Dec. 1886, which sadly illustrates and accentuates the leading characteristics

of previous notices viz: ignorance, innuendoes and untruthfulness.

Notwithstanding the frequent communications which the C. M. S. Committee acknowledge to have received from their agents here, and the visit of Deputies last spring they are still so ignorant of this land question and its bearing as to say "The Provincial Government arranged to survey the land as a token of their control over it, and to appoint an Indian agent." It was the Dominion and not the Provincial Government who did this. The point would hardly be worth referring to were it not that the C. M. S. so confidently asserts their thorough acquaintance with the case in all its bearings. The force of the charge against Mr. Duncan of sanctioning lawless proceedings, accompanied as it is with the insinuation that he instigated them, must necessarily depend on what action was taken. The Indians put up a house on the two acres, and they stopped a surveyor.

The Indians claim the two acres which are situated in the middle of their village as their property, and they also claim that these two acres were unjustly taken from them by the Provincial Government. Legal opinion went to confirm their claims but the Government refused to surrender the land and it was that the matter might be tested in the courts that the house was quickly and quietly erected on the land. No interference was made with the Bishop's domestic arrangements. This was a perfectly legal and proper proceeding on the part of the Indians and carried out in such an orderly way that even our adversaries could not associate it with disorder or riot.

In preventing the surveyor sent by the Dominion Government, the Indians were simply asserting their just and equitable right to be dealt with on the same principle and in the same way as *all* other Indians in *every* other Province of the Dominion. They are not asking to be permitted to prevent the settling up of the country, but that those privileges and rights which they have enjoyed for ages, and from which they derive much of their living, should be secured to them, or where this is impossible, that they should be remunerated for their loss. That in stopping the surveyor they unwittingly violated a provincial statute is true, but it is also true that as soon as they knew of the statute they immediately pleaded guilty to the violation, expressed their regret, and bore their punishment without a murmur, and thereby gave proof of that law abiding and Christian true spirit which has actuated them from the first.

As regards that portion of the paragraph which refers to the landing of Bishop Ridley, had it appeared in an ordinary newspaper it might well be treated as a huge joke, but appearing where it does it affords a most melancholy example of the length to which the agents of the Society, emboldened by our long forbearance and silence, are prepared to go in their endeavour to blind christians at home and to bolster up the indefensible position of the Society at Metlakatla.

That the building was occupied by armed men—that there was the smallest idea of preventing the Bishop's landing—or the least show of resistance, or any ground for apprehension on the part of Bishop or Mrs. Ridley, or that crowds of Indians awaited him, or that they were cowed by and fell back from his armed adherents, is all simply untrue. Can anything be more lamentably shocking than that, in giving a simple account, those who were eye witnesses and supposed to be above equivocation, much more falsehood, should fall so low.

Two questions naturally suggest themselves in connection with this incident. The first is, whether the Bishop, by sanctioning, if not directly approving, of the conduct of the C. M. S. adherents at Metlakatla, men and *women* coming armed to protect him and this be it remembered against those who had not even threatened him much less displayed arms, whether, I say bearing this in mind, the saying "that Missionary work which once was carried on by a Henry Martyn is now carried on by a Martini Henry," has not passed from a sceptic's sneer to an actual fact?

The second and more serious question is, if the notices of these missions which have appeared in the Society's publications are so much at variance with the facts they are supposed to relate what credence can be given to the accounts of the work carried on at other missions of the Society? Has not the time come when the Christian public should demand an opportunity of judging of these facts other than from the garbled accounts of prejudiced secretaries.

ROBERT TOMLINSON.